



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/762,531	01/23/2004	Tony Hulkkonen	059643.00361	5351
32294 7590 06/24/2008 SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P. 8000 TOWERS CRESCENT DRIVE 14TH FLOOR VIENNA, VA 22182-6212				
EXAMINER				
D AGOSTA, STEPHEN M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2617				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/24/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/762,531

Applicant(s)

HULKONEN ET AL.

Examiner

Stephen M. D'Agosta

Art Unit

2617

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 May 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,6,7,11,13-18,20,21,25-27,30,32-36,40 and 42-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,6,7,11,13-18,20,21,25,26,30,32-36,40 and 42-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 27 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Final Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5-13-2008 has been entered.

1. It is the examiner's position that the claims merely read on "over-riding" a denial of service if/when the user is in an emergency situation, which the prior art clearly teaches.

2. A USC 103 rejection has been put forth and thusly the recent KSR case law ruling applies. The examiner notes that **absent evidence** that the modifications necessary to effect the combination of elements is **uniquely challenging or difficult for one of ordinary skill** the claims are also deemed unpatentable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 6-7, 11-16, 17-18, 20-21, 25-26, 30, 32-33, 35-36, 42, 45-47 and 50

rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andersson et al. US 6,230,017 and further in view of Valentine et al. US 6,011,973 and (Hanson OR Block).

As per **claims 1, 18, 20, 35, 46-47 and 50**, Andersson teaches a method, comprising:

Receiving a network access request from a user equipment in a network (figure 3 shows a Call Origination Request #3-1 and Call Completions #3-3, #3-9, #3-22):

Determining if the network access request is an emergency call independence on an indication, received from the user equipment or from the network, that the network access request is an emergency call (figure 3, #3-2 shows determining if an emergency number is dialed, eg. 911),

But is silent on

Disabling selective access to the network in response to determining that the network access request is an emergency call and in response to detecting the establishment of the radio access bearer;

Detecting establishment of a radio access bearer channel.

The examiner notes that Andersson fully teaches the concept of "denying access" based on user location but overrides said access if the call is an emergency call. Andersson's "difference" is seen in the actual steps/procedures he performs (eg. he overrides the location determination if an emergency call is received). The examiner notes that Andersson does allow for one skilled in the art to make "...various alterations may be made without departing from the spirit and scope of the invention (C12, L1-5).

Similarly, the examiner puts forth **Valentine** who determines the geographical location of a mobile user first before allowing/denying operation of the mobile to make/receive calls (Abstract, figure 3). Therefore the exact "steps" used are open to modification (eg. Andersson doesn't first check location of user while Valentine does), hence one would re-arrange said steps within the spirit and scope of these pieces of art to arrive at the claimed inventive concept (eg. determine if emergency call, determine location, process call based on location).

The examiner notes that "other" selective disabling methods are known which deal with completely different parameters, eg. such as billing and credit where the user's account is monitored for a non-zero balance and/or credit-worthiness).

a. **Hanson teaches credit monitoring (C5, L25-51):** However, if the call is not permitted according to the customer credit profile verification, the call is not completed except certain calls such as those for emergency 911 or customer service. Further, if certain restrictive conditions according to the credit profile is met while in the middle of a call, the call is disconnected immediately. For example, the length of the call may have caused the customer to approach his/her pre-established credit limit, therefore the call is terminated or the customer is given the option of providing a credit card number to which to charge the additional amounts over the credit limit to continue the call.

b. **Block teaches monitoring for a user's balance and denying a call and/or request for a channel if the balance is low/zero:** The Channel Billing Monitor 20 also includes a relay switch 21 driven by a relay driver 27 as instructed by the Microprocessor 28a. For example, if the subscriber does not have an adequate usable balance, the Microprocessor 28a instructs the relay driver 27 to open the switch 21 to disconnect Sub. n. For certain calls such as emergency calls or calls to the service provider, the Microprocessor 28a can instruct the relay driver 27 to close the

switch 21 and connect Sub. n. (figure 12b, step #12040 and C5, L10-20)

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify Andersson, such that it disables selective access to the network in response to determining that the network access request is an emergency call and in response to detecting the establishment of the radio access bearer AND detects establishment of a radio access bearer channel, to provide means for only allowing emergency calls if a user is denied service based on location, credit, balance, etc..

With further regard to claims 18-19, Andersson teaches "computer code/programs" being embodied by the implementation of figure 3 which requires software code/programs running on a processor to perform the stated operations/commands. Andersson and Valentine both teach denial of service based on location.

With further regard to claims 20 and 46, Andersson teaches various network elements that are involved with the access/denial of calls to/from a mobile device based on its current cell location. Furthermore, Andersson shows that the HLR/VLR stores Allowed Cell lists and thus reads on a "network element".

With further regard to claims 35 and 47, Andersson teaches a communication system (see figure 1a).

As per **claims 2 and 48-49**, Andersson teaches claim 1, wherein said receiving includes receiving the network access information that comprises network area access information (figures 2a thru 2d show "Allowed Cells List" which reads on which cells a mobile can/can't access).

As per **claims 6**, Andersson teaches claim 1/20, wherein said selectively controlling includes selectively controlling the network which comprises an access network and a core network (figures 2a-2d show access lists stored in the HLR to control whether the network components, eg. access/core components, allow in/outgoing calls to/from the mobile).

As per **claim 7**, Andersson teaches claim 6, wherein the controlling and the disabling the access to the network are performed in the access network (figures 2a-2d show the HLR/VLR as storing the access control data which is used by the MSC/BSC/BTS to allow/deny access).

As per **claims 11 and 30**, Andersson teaches claim 10/29, wherein said disabling includes disabling for a predetermined time period (figure 2d shows Restricted Times, #116D and #118D, which provides a "time range" whereby calls are allowed/denied, hence a time period is taught. A "timer" must be inherently used in order to measure the elapsed time).

As per **claims 12-13**, Andersson teaches claim 10, further comprising: detecting establishment of a radio access bearer; and responsive thereto, activating the disabling the selectively controlling access to the network for an emergency call network access AND activating the disabling the selectively controlling access to the network only for the emergency call network access associated with that radio access bearer. (See C9, L59-67).

As per **claim 14**, Andersson teaches claim 10, further comprising: terminating said disabling responsive to a control signal (figure 3 shows that each-and-every call begins with a new call operation, hence a "control signal" must be utilized to "reset" the process of figure 3 so that the disablement is not turned on once and then left on. One skilled understands that control signals are used between the network elements to properly control the devices such that each call is identified as being "allowed or denied" and then checked to see if is an emergency call or not).

As per **claims 15 and 25-26**, Andersson teaches claim 6/20, further comprising: receiving the network access information from the core network (Similar to the rejection of claim 1, the examiner interprets that the Network Access information is inputted by a Network Admin and accessed/transmitted from the HLR/VLR to the appropriate network components, eg. MSC/BSC/BTS).

As per **claims 16, 36 and 42**, Andersson teaches claim 1/20/35, further comprising: detecting termination of an emergency call; and, responsive thereto, enabling the selectively controlling access to the network (figure 3 shows the process of a normal call and an emergency call being completed. The examiner notes that the "enabled/disabled control" process would be "reset" after each-and-every call).

As per **claims 17 and 45**, Andersson teaches claim 1/35, further comprising: performing the method in a mobile communication system (figure 1a) **but is silent on** a third generation partnership project.

Andersson does not limit himself to a certain type/generation of mobile network and allows for one skilled to modify various elements/methods within the spirit and scope of the invention (C12, L1-5).

The examiner takes **Official Notice** that 3GPP mobile networks are known in the art and provide similar services (eg. backward compatible) as those from previous generations. Hence one skilled would modify Andersson's patented concepts and apply them to future (eg. 3GPP) mobile networks.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify Andersson, such that 3GPP networks are supported, to provide means for supporting industry standards in new/future networks when they are rolled out.

As per **claim 21**, Andersson teaches claim 20, wherein the network access information is shared network area access information (Figures 1a thru 2d show that the access information is stored in a shared network element, eg. HLR/VLR).

As per **claim 25-26**, Andersson teaches claim 20, wherein said selectively controlling includes selectively controlling the network which comprises an access network and a core network (figures 2a-2d show access lists stored in the HLR to control whether the network components, eg. access/core components, allow in/outgoing calls to/from the mobile).

As per **claim 30**, Andersson teaches claim 29, wherein said disabling includes disabling for a predetermined time period (figure 2d shows Restricted Times, #116D and #118D, which provides a "time range" whereby calls are allowed/denied, hence a time period is taught. A "timer" must be inherently used in order to measure the elapsed time).

As per **claim 32**, Andersson teaches claim 25, further comprising: receiving the network access information from the core network (Similar to the rejection of claim 1, the examiner interprets that the Network Access information is inputted by a Network Admin and accessed/transmitted from the HLR/VLR to the appropriate network components, eg. MSC/BSC/BTS).

As per **claim 33**, Andersson teaches claim 20, further comprising: detecting termination of an emergency call; and, responsive thereto, enabling the selectively controlling access to the network (figure 3 shows the process of a normal call and an emergency call being completed. The examiner notes that the "enabled/disabled control" process would be "reset" after each-and-every call).

Claims 34 and 40 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andersson/Valentine and further in view of Lindgren.

As per **claim 34**, Andersson teaches claim 26, wherein the network element is a radio network controller of a radio access network (figure 1a shows the mobile communicating with a BTS/BSC/MSC).

As per **claim 40**, Andersson teaches claim 39, wherein said disabling includes disabling for a predetermined time period (figure 2d shows Restricted Times, #116D and #118D, which provides a "time range" whereby calls are allowed/denied, hence a time period is taught. A "timer" must be inherently used in order to measure the elapsed time).

Claims 43-44 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andersson/Valentine and further in view of Kowaguchi and Choi et al..

As per **claims 43-44**, Andersson teaches claim 35 **but is silent on** further including means for receiving an indication of emergency call on relocation call to access network AND/OR further including means transmitting an indication the emergency call on relocation of the call another access network.

The primary examiner notes that Lindgren does discuss the fact that the user may be roaming (C5, L12-22) and determining the "identity of the locally geographic VoIP call server that should receive the forthcoming call control signals from the mobile phone" which suggests Lindgren does understand that the location of the mobile user is important and must be determined. Also, since the call is an emergency call, a handover (eg. relocation of the call to another network) must be supported as well.

The examiner also notes that **Kowaguchi** teaches a mobile device that can determine it's own location and then use an inhibit table to turn itself Off/On (Abstract), eg. no "network access information" is needed to be received from the network. Furthermore, **Choi** teaches handing off an emergency call (C6, L42-53):

"...Reference is now made to FIG. 5 wherein there is shown a message flow and network operation diagram illustrating use of an information request message in accordance with the present invention to request call related information following inter- exchange hand-off of an emergency services call. An emergency services call (e.g., a 911 call) 500 is currently in existence and has proceeded through a completed inter-exchange hand-off. Thus, both a serving exchange 502 and an anchor exchange 504 are implicated in handling the call 500 between a mobile station 506 and an emergency services center 508..."

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify Lindgren, such that it includes means for receiving an indication of emergency call on relocation call to access network AND/OR further including means transmitting an indication the emergency call on relocation of the call to another access network, to provide means for supporting the emergency call during relocation/handoff.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 27 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen M. D'Agosta whose telephone number is 571-272-7862. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8am to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bill Trost can be reached on 571-272-7872. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Stephen M. D'Agosta/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2617